

REMARKS

Favorable consideration of this Application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

After entry of the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 14-16, and 19-21 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been amended. Support for the amendment of Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 can be found at least on page 16, line 21 through page 19 line 19. No new matter has been added.

By way of summary, the Official Action presents the following issues: Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Prust (U.S. Patent No. 6,714,968) in view of Burson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,245, hereinafter Burson), in further view of Cohen (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,941); Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being anticipated to Prust and Burson, in further view of Hayes, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,826, hereinafter Hayes).

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed May 21, 2005 and March 8, 2004. Applicants note that the documents cited in these IDS filings have yet to be indicated as considered by the Examiner. As such, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an initialed Form 1449 in the next communication.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Official Action has rejected Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Prust in view of Burson, in further view of Cohen. The Official Action states that Prust discloses all of the Applicants' claim limitations, with the exception of receiving one or more automatic upload programs, transferring a control file

used for controlling access by another user, and establishing personal storage areas. The Official Action cites Burson and Cohen as disclosing these more detailed aspects of the Applicants' invention, and states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the cited references for arriving at the Applicants' claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing device, including:

An information processing device, comprising:

. . . transmitting means for transmitting user registration data necessary to secure a user's exclusive storage area in a server connected in a network, to said server over a network;

receiving means for receiving address data defined, in part, by the user registration data, the address designated as an access point indicating said exclusive storage area over said network and for receiving one or more automatic upload programs . . .

By way of background, in publishing content to an internet home page, it is necessary for a user to manually access a designated storage area of a web server in order to load content to the home page. This manual interaction is tedious for individuals wishing to update a home page repeatedly.¹

In light of at least the above deficiencies in the art, the present invention is provided. With at least this object in mind, a brief comparison of the claimed invention, in view of the cited references, is believed to be in order.

Prust describes a computing environment (200), in which client computers (205) access a storage network (220). The storage network includes individual storage areas (225), which can be assigned to different users.² Upon registration, the storage network allocates a specific storage area to a user. Access methods include utilizing a user interface of a local

¹ Application at pages 1-2.

² Prust at column 4, lines 52-63.

operating system of the client computer. In another embodiment, the user-designated storage area may be accessed by a web browser.³

As can be appreciated, access of the storage area in Prust is via manual operation of a web browser.⁴ Applicants' amended Claim 1, and any claim depending therefrom, recite receiving address data, which is defined, in part, by the user registration data, wherein automatic upload programs perform connection processing automatically to said access point; Prust clearly does not disclose this feature. Likewise, as neither Burson, nor Cohen, satisfy the deficiency discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, and any claim depending therefrom, are allowable over the cited combination of references. Moreover, as independent Claims 6, 11, and 16 recite substantially similar limitations to that discussed above, these claims and any corresponding dependent claims are likewise allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

The Official Action has rejected Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Prust and Burson, in further view of Hayes. The Official Action cites Prust and Burson as disclosing all of the Applicants' claim limitations, with the exception of an icon for driving an automatic upload program. The Official Action cites Hayes as disclosing this more detailed aspect of the Applicants' invention, and states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the cited references for arriving at the Applicants' claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

³ Prust at column 5, lines 28-31.

⁴ Prust at column 5, lines 51-53; column 7, lines 3-6.

As discussed above, neither Prust and/or Burson, either alone or in combination, suggest all of the elements of the Applicants' claims, and Hayes does not remedy the deficiency discussed above. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Therefore, Hayes does not anticipate, or render obvious, the subject matter defined by the present claims when considered alone or in combination with Prust and/or Burson. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present Application, including Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 14-16, and 19-21, is patently distinguished over the prior art, in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073
Attorney of Record

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866

CUSTOMER NUMBER
22850

Phone: 703-413-3000
Fax: 703-413-2220

BDL:SAM:yc's

I:\atty\sam\prosecution Work\275747\Amdt due 14Dec05.doc